

bear the common or usual name of each active ingredient since the statement on the jar labels and the individual carton labels, "Contains: Stramonium Alk. .05%, Oil of Sassafras, Elder Flowers, Bayberry, Rosin, Beeswax, in a Suitable Base," was not a statement of the active ingredients.

On February 27, 1942, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**687. Misbranding of Savol and Savol Cream. U. S. v. 2 1/8 Dozen Packages of Savol and 2 1/8 Dozen Packages of Savol Cream. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. Nos. 5901, 5902. Sample Nos. 64167-E, 64168-E.)**

The labels of both of these products, in addition to bearing false and misleading claims, failed to bear the required ingredient and accurate quantity of contents statements. Furthermore, the cartons containing the bottles of Savol were unnecessarily large.

On September 29, 1941, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Ohio filed libels against the above-named products at Youngstown, Ohio, alleging that they had been shipped within the period from on or about June 23 to on or about August 13, 1941, by the Savol Chemical Co. from Mercer, Pa.; and charging that they were misbranded.

Analyses of samples of the articles showed that Savol consisted essentially of cresols, alkali soaps and water; and that the Savol Cream consisted essentially of zinc oxide, barium sulfate, petrolatum, and perfume materials.

The Savol was alleged to be misbranded (1) in that statements in the labeling which represented that it would be efficacious to protect against and prevent serious infection; that it would be efficacious in the treatment of bites of animals, open sores, irritation of the throat or nasal passages arising from catarrh, hay fever, or kindred ills; that it would minimize the possibility of infected sores, abscesses, boils, felons, and all complications due to infections, and that it would always be helpful and often curative, were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for such purposes; and (2) in that its container was so made, formed, or filled as to be misleading.

The Savol Cream was alleged to be misbranded in that statements in the labeling which represented that it was an antiseptic and would be efficacious in the treatment of cuts, boils, felons, sores, ulcers, itching and all forms of piles, eczema, skin affections in general, and bites of animals; that it would be efficacious for the after treatment of carbuncles and erysipelas and in the treatment of sore throat, croup, and enlarged glands when used on the neck, were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for such purposes.

Both products were alleged to be misbranded (1) in that their labels failed to bear the common or usual names of the active ingredients; and (2) in that their labels failed to bear an accurate statement of the quantity of contents.

On November 26, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**688. Misbranding of Waft-Surgical. U. S. v. 11 Gallon Bottles of Waft-Surgical. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 5810. Sample No. 49661-E.)**

The labeling of this product bore false and misleading antiseptic and therapeutic claims and also failed to bear the common or usual names of the active ingredients.

On September 22, 1941, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Texas filed a libel against the above-named product at Rusk, Tex., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce from Springfield, Ill.; a portion on or about April 20, 1940, by Waft Products, Inc., and the remainder on or about June 13, 1941, by the Federal Cosmetic Sales Corporation; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis showed that the article consisted essentially of water and formaldehyde, with small amounts of terpineol and a yellow-green coloring material.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that representations in the labeling that it had a phenol coefficient of 70, that it would be efficacious as an antiseptic, disinfectant, fungicide, germicide, parasiticide, in the dilutions suggested; that it would be of value as a wet dressing or application on wounds in the dilutions suggested; that it would inhibit disease producing micro-organisms and would be efficacious for sterilization of surgical instruments; that it would be efficacious for general prophylactic treatment; that it would be efficacious in the treatment of wounds and infections, would neutralize fetid odors; would control obnoxious odors incident to tissue breakdown due to cancer, gangrene, "infected amputations," pus drainage, fistulae, urinary fecal, etc.; that when used as a wet dress